Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics manuscript no.
(LaTeX: ms1733.tex; printed on April 3, 2014; 0:17)

arXiv:1404.0433v1 [astro-ph.CO] 2 Apr 2014

Constraints on the ultracompact minihalos using neutrino signals from the gravitino dark matter decay *

Yunlong Zheng[1], Yupeng Yang[1,2,4,5], Mingzhe Li[3], Hongshi Zong[1,5]

[1] Department of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093,China; *yyp@chenwang.nju.edu.cn*

[2] Department of Astronomy, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China

[3] Interdisciplinary Center for Theoretical Study, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China

[4] Collage of Physics and Electrical Engineering, Anyang Normal University, Anyang 455000, China

[5] Joint Center for Particle, Nuclear Physics and Cosmology, Nanjing University-Purple mountain Observatory, Nanjing 210093, China

Abstract Ultracompact dark matter minihalos (UCMHs) would be formed during the earlier universe if there were large density perturbations. If the dark matter can decay into the standard model particles, such as neutrinos, these objects would become the potential astrophysical sources and could be detected by the related instruments, such as IceCube. In this paper, we investigate the neutrino signals from the nearby UCMHs due to the gravitino dark matter decay and compare these signals with the background neutrino flux which is mainly from the atmosphere to get the constraints on the abundance of UCMHs.

Key words: dark matter — early universe — dark matter halos

1 INTRODUCTION

Structure formation is one of important research fields in cosmology. According to the theory, the present cosmic structures originated from the earlier density perturbations with the amplitude $\delta\rho/\rho \sim 10^{-5}$ and this has been confirmed by many observations. On the other hand, primordial black holes would be formed if there were large density perturbations ($\delta\rho/\rho > 0.3$) in the earlier universe (Green & Liddle 1997). Recently, Ricotti & Gould (2009) found that if the amplitude of density perturbations was between above values a new kind of dark matter structures named ultracompact dark matter minihalos (UCMHs) would be formed. Compared with the classical dark matter halos, the formation time of these objects is earlier ($z \sim 1000$) and the density profile is steeper ($\rho(r) \sim r^{-2.25}$). If dark matter is in the form of weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs), such as the neutralino, they can annihilate into the standard model particles, such as photons, positrons or neutrinos (Jungman et al. 1996; Bertone et al. 2005). Moreover, because the dark

matter annihilation rate is proportional to the square of number density, the UCMHs would become one kind of the potential astrophysical sources (Scott & Sivertsson 2009; Bringmann et al. 2012; Yang et al. 2013a,b). Besides the annihilation, decay is another important approach to detect dark matter signals. This is especially crucial for those dark matter candidates which do not annihilate. A famous example is the gravitino dark matter which in some supergravity models is the lightest supersymmetric particle (Bertone et al. 2005). Although compared with the annihilation the decay rate is proportional to the number density instead of the number density square, the decay is still very important for the cosmological probes for the dark matter particles which do not have the annihilation channels. Yang et al. (2013c) have investigated the gamma-ray flux from nearby UCMHs due to the dark matter decay. Through comparing with the observations they obtained the constraints on the abundance of UCMHs for different decay channels, lifetimes and density profiles of Milky Way. They found that the strongest constraint comes from the $b\bar{b}$ channel with the dark matter mass $m_\chi = 100\mathrm{GeV}$, the fraction of UCMHs is $f_{\mathrm{UCMHs}} \sim 5 \times 10^{-5}$.

Besides the high energy photons the other kind of important products of dark matter decay are neutrinos and they usually accompany with photons. The advantage of neutrino detection is that neutrinos can propagate in the space without attenuation due to its very weakly interaction with other particles. Therefore, comparing with other particles (e.g. electrons and positrons) the orientation of corresponding sources can be confirmed directly. When neutrinos propagate through the medium, such as the ice, muons (μ) can be produced by the charged current interaction and detected by the Cherenkov radiation detector. Because the neutrino signals accompanying with the production of gamma-ray, the study on neutrino signals would be complementary to the gamma-ray observations especially for the larger dark matter mass and lepton channels (Sandick et al. 2010a; Abbasi et al. 2011; Ackermann et al. 2011). In this paper, we will investigate the neutrino signals from UCMHs due to the dark matter decay. As we have not observed any excess of neutrino flux comparing with the atmospheric neutrino flux, we get the constraints on the abundance of UCMHs.

This paper is organised as follows. The neutrino flux from nearby UCMHs due to dark matter decay are studied in section 2. In section 3, we obtain the constraints on the fraction of UCMHs. We conclude with discussions in section 4.

2 THE BASIC QUALITY OF UCMHS AND POTENTIAL NEUTRINO SIGNALS DUE TO DARK MATTER DECAY

After the formation of UCMHs, the dark matter particles will be accreted by the radial infall. The density profile of UCMHs can be obtained through the simulation (Ricotti & Gould 2009; Scott & Sivertsson 2009),

$$\rho(r,z) = \frac{3 f_\chi M_{\mathrm{UCMHs}}(z)}{16\pi R(z)^{\frac{3}{4}} r^{\frac{9}{4}}} \tag{1}$$

where $M_{\mathrm{UCMHs}}(z) = M_i \frac{1+z_{\mathrm{eq}}}{1+z}$ is the mass of UCMHs and M_i is the mass within the scale of perturbations, $R(z) = 0.019(\frac{1000}{z+1})(\frac{M_{\mathrm{UCMHs}}(z)}{M_\odot})^{\frac{1}{3}}\mathrm{pc}$ is the radius of UCMHs at redshift z and $f_\chi = \frac{\Omega_{\mathrm{CDM}}}{\Omega_{\mathrm{CDM}}+\Omega_{\mathrm{b}}} = 0.83$ (Komatsu et al. 2011).

The muons produced in the detector through the charged current interactions are called contained events.

$$\frac{d\phi_\mu}{dE_\mu} = \int_{E_\mu}^{m_\chi} dE_\nu \frac{d\phi_\nu}{dE_\nu} \frac{N_A \rho}{2} \left(\frac{d\sigma_\nu^P(E_\nu, E_\mu)}{dE_\mu} + (p \to n) \right) + (\nu \to \overline{\nu}), \tag{2}$$

where $N_A = 6.022 \times 10^{23}$ is Avogadro's number and ρ is the density of medium. $d\sigma^{p,n}_{\nu,\overline{\nu}}/dE_\mu$ are the weak scattering charged-current cross sections for neutrino and antineutrino scattering with protons and neutrons. $d\phi_\nu/dE_\nu$ is the differential flux of neutrino from UCMHs due to dark matter decay,

$$\frac{d\phi_\nu}{dE_\nu} = \frac{1}{d^2} \times \frac{1}{m_\chi \tau} \left(\sum B_F \frac{dN_\nu^F}{dE_\nu} \right) \int \rho(r) r^2 dr, \tag{3}$$

where dN_ν/dE_ν is the neutrino number per dark matter decay, B_F is the branching ratio of every decay channel. m_χ and τ are the dark matter mass and lifetime respectively. d is the distance of UCMHs. In this paper, we consider gravitino ($\psi_{\frac{3}{2}}$) as the dark matter decay model. The gravitino is the lightest supersymmetric particle and they can decay into standard model particles in the presence of R-parity breaking (Steffen 2009). There are three-body and two-body decay models for the gravitino particles and the three-body decay models can supply one of the explainations of positron excess observed by the PAMELA and Fermi experiments (Bajc et al. 2010). In this paper, we mainly consider this model, $\psi_{\frac{3}{2}} \to l^+ l^- \nu$. Here, l could be μ or τ. Because the observation and identification of the ν_μ is easier than that of the ν_τ, so we mainly consider the $\mu(\nu_\mu)$ channel. On the other hand, the second muon neutrinos can also be produced through the decay of μ which are from the three-body decay. Although the contribution of these process are much smaller than the primary case, we also include them in our calculations. For the neutrino spectrum of these decay channels, we use the forms which have been given in the Refs. (Erkoca et al. (2010b)).

Besides the contained events, the muons flux produced before arriving at the detector is called upward events (Erkoca et al. 2009; Yuan et al. 2010),

$$\frac{d\phi_\mu}{dE_\mu} = \int_{E_\mu}^{m_\chi} dE_\nu \frac{d\phi_\nu}{dE_\nu} \frac{N_A \rho}{2} \left(\frac{d\sigma_\nu^P(E_\nu, E_\mu)}{dE_\mu} + (p \to n) \right) R(E_\mu) + (\nu \to \overline{\nu}), \tag{4}$$

where $R(E_\mu)$ is the muon range or stopping distance at which muons can propagate in matter until their energy is below the threshold of the detector E_μ^{th} and it is given by $R(E_\mu) = \frac{1}{\beta\rho} \ln(\frac{\alpha+\beta E_\mu}{\alpha+\beta E_\mu^{th}})$ (Sandick et al. 2010b), with α corresponding to the ionization energy loss and β accounts for the bremsstrahlung pair production and photonuclear interactions.

For the neutrino detection, the main background is from the atmosphere. The angle-averaged atmospheric flux (ATM) is in the form of (in units of $\mathrm{Gev}^{-1}\mathrm{km}^{-2}\mathrm{yr}^{-1}\mathrm{sr}^{-1}$) (Erkoca et al. 2010a)

$$\left(\frac{d\phi_\nu}{dE_\nu d\Omega} \right)_{\mathrm{ATM}} = N_0 E_\nu^{-\gamma-1} \times \left(\frac{a}{bE_\nu} \ln(1 + bE_\nu) + \frac{c}{eE_\nu} \ln(1 + eE_\nu) \right) \tag{5}$$

where $a = 0.018, b = 0.024, c = 0.0069, e = 0.00139$, $\gamma = 1.74$ and $N_0 = 1.95(1.35) \times 10^{17}$ for $\nu(\bar{\nu})$.

In the Figs. 1 and 2, the neutrino flux from nearby UCMHs ($d_{\mathrm{UCMHs}} = 1\mathrm{kpc}$) are shown for different dark matter mass. For these results, we set the dark matter decay rate as $\Gamma = 10^{-26}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ and treat the distribution of neutrino flavors at earth as 1:1:1 which is due to vacuum oscillation during the propagation. From these figures, it can be seen that for the fixed mass of UCMHs, the flux would excess the ATM for the larger dark matter mass. For the fixed mass of dark matter, the flux have excess the ATM for the bigger UCMHs. The similar results can also be found in our another work (Yang et al. 2013b) where the neutrino



Fig. 1: The potential neutrino flux for the upward events from nearby UCMHs due to the gravitino decay. The distance of UCMHs is $d = 1\mathrm{kpc}$ and the decay rate is $\Gamma = 10^{-26}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$. Right: the neutrino flux for the fixed dark matter mass $m_\chi = 1\mathrm{TeV}$ and the mass of UCMHs $M_{\mathrm{UCMHs}} = 1\mathrm{M}_\odot$ (solid line), $10^4\mathrm{M}_\odot$ (long-dashed line), $10^8\mathrm{M}_\odot$ (dot-dashed line) from bottom to up respectively. Left: the neutrino flux for the fixed mass of UCMHs $M_{\mathrm{UCMHs}} = 10^8\mathrm{M}_\odot$ and the dark matter mass $m_\chi = 0.5\mathrm{TeV}$ (solid), $1\mathrm{TeV}$ (long-dashed line), $10\mathrm{TeV}$ (dot-dashed line) from left to right respectively. The neutrino flux from the atmosphere are also shown (thick solid line).

3 CONSTRAINTS ON THE ABUNDANCE OF UCMHS

After the formation of UCMHs, one of the important questions is about the abundance of them in our universe. According to above discussions, this issue can be solved through studying the present different observational results (Bringmann et al. 2012; Yang et al. 2013b,a,c; Josan & Green 2010; Yang et al. 2011a,b). In the previous work, we get the constraints on the abundance of UCMHs considering the neutrino signals due to dark matter annihilation (Yang et al. 2013b). In this section, we will investigate the fraction of UCMHs in the case of dark matter decay.

Following the previous works (e.g. Bringmann et al. (2012)), we assume that the UCMHs are distributed uniformly and the abundance is the same everywhere in our universe. The mass function is in the delta form which means that all of these objects have the same mass. Therefore, the fraction of UCMHs can be written as (Josan & Green 2010)

$$f_{\mathrm{UCMH}} = \frac{M_{\mathrm{UCMH}}}{M_{\mathrm{DM,MW}}(< d)} \tag{6}$$

Where $M_{\mathrm{DM,MW}}(< d)$ is the dark matter mass of Milky Way within the distance d and in this work we use



Fig. 2: The potential neutrino flux for the contained events from nearby UCMHs due to the gravitino decay. The parameters are the same as in the Fig. 1.

In the section 2, it can be seen that the neutrino flux would excess the ATM for some cases. During the exposure times, such as ten years, considering the contamination of atmoshere background, the minimal number of muons from UCMHs for the fixed distance and 2σ statistic significance can be obtained as $N_{\rm UCMHs}/\sqrt{N_{\rm UCMHs}+N_{\rm ATM}}=2$, where $N_{\rm UCMHs}$ can be obtained by integration

$$N_{\rm UCMHs}=\int_{E_\mu^{th}}^{E_{\rm max}}\frac{d\phi_\mu}{dE_\mu}F_{\rm eff}(E_\mu)dE_\mu, \tag{7}$$

where $F_{\rm eff}(E_\mu)$ is the effective volume $V_{\rm eff}$ and effective area $A_{\rm eff}$ of the detector for the contained and upward events respectively. For the IceCube, we neglect the energy dependence and accept that $V_{\rm eff}=0.04{\rm km}^3$, $A_{\rm eff}=1{\rm km}^2$. The final results are shown in the Fig. 3.

From these results it can be seen that the strongest constraints is $f_{\rm UCMHs}\sim 2\times10^{-3}$ for the dark matter mass $m_{\rm DM}=10{\rm TeV}$ for the upward events. For the case of contained events, the constraints are weaker and the strongest constraints is $f_{\rm UCMHs}\sim 0.1$. So the upward events is much more competitive for the constraints on UCMHs and the limits will be stronger for the larger dark matter mass. On the other hand, comparing with the dark matter annihilation cases, these constraints are weaker. However, as we have mentioned in above sections that if the dark matter particles do not annihilate, dark matter decay will be important, so these results are still very significant.

4 DISCUSSIONS

The UCMHs would be formed if there are large density perturbations during the earlier epoch and then its cosmological abundance become one of the important issuses. In the previous works, the main limits are from the research of the gamma-ray flux due to dark matter annihilation within UCMHs. In our recently



Fig. 3: The constraints on the abundance of UCMHs using the potential neutrino signals, contained events(Right) and upward events(Left). We have chosen the dark matter mass $m_\chi = 1\mathrm{TeV}$(solid line), $10\mathrm{TeV}$(dashed line) and set the decay rate as $\Gamma = 10^{-26}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$.

gamma-ray flux due to the dark matter decay (Yang et al. (2013c,b)). In this work, we extended these works and investigated the neutrino flux from nearby UCMHs due to the gravitino particles decay. The decay styles of gravitino include two-body and three-body decays. The latter can also provide one of the explanations of the positrons (or positrons plus electrons) excess which have been observed recently by the PAMALE and Fermi. In this work, we mainly considered the three-body decay style. Most of this decay productions are leptons, therefore, the neutrinos will be plenty. We researched the neutrino flux from nearby UCMHs due to the dark matter decay and compared that with the signals from the atmosphere which is the main background of neutrino detection. We found that for the larger dark matter mass or the UCMHs the final flux would excess the ATM. These results are similar to the dark matter annihilation cases (Yang et al. 2013b). On the other hand, because we have not observed any excess of neutrino flux from nearby unknown sources, so the abundance of UCMHs can be constrained. We considered ten years exposure times for neutrino observation and signals with 2σ statistic significance to get the limits on the fraction of UCMHs. In this work, we also assumed that the distribution of these objects is uniform in the universe. We found that the strongest limits on the abundance of UCMHs is $f_{\rm UCMHs} \sim 10^{-3}$. One should note that these results depend on the dark matter mass. From the Fig. 3, it can be seen that the limits will be stronger for the larger dark matter mass. Moreover, the final constraints are stronger for the upward events comparing with the contained events. The other important parameters is the dark matter decay rate. In this paper, we have used the conservative value, $\Gamma = 10^{-26}\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ for our research. There are many works where the constraints on the decay rate of gravitino are obtained. Huang et al. (2012) used the Fermi observations of nearby galaxy clusters to get the constraints on this parameter. They found that the limits on the lifetimes of gravitino from the clusters observations is $\tau(1/\Gamma) \sim 2 \times 10^{26} s$ and it is mostly independent of on the dark matter mass. The limits obtained from the lines signals are different and the lifetime becomes smaller with the increasing

For the future neutrino observations, such as KM3Net, because its effective area and volume will be improved, it is expected that the constraints on the abundance of UCMHs will be much more stronger.

Acknowledgements We thanks Xiao-Jun Bi and Xiao-Yuan Huang for very usefull comments and suggestions. Yu-Peng Yang is supported by the National Science Foundation for Post-doctoral Scientists of China (Grant No.2013M540434) and the Special Funds of the National Science Foundation of China (Grant No.11347148). Ming-Zhe Li is supported in part by National Science Foundation of China under Grants Nos. 11075074 and 11065004.

References

Abbasi, R., et al. 2011 2

Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., Albert, A., et al. 2011, Phys. Rev. Lett., 107, 241302 2

Bajc, B., Enkhbat, T., Ghosh, D. K., Senjanovic, G., & Zhang, Y. 2010, JHEP, 1005, 048 3

Bertone, G., Hooper, D., & Silk, J. 2005, Phys.Rept., 405, 279 1, 2

Bringmann, T., Scott, P., & Akrami, Y. 2012, Phys. Rev. D, 85, 125027 2, 4

Erkoca, A. E., Gelmini, G., Reno, M. H., & Sarcevic, I. 2010a, Phys.Rev., D81, 096007 3

Erkoca, A. E., Reno, M. H., & Sarcevic, I. 2009, Phys. Rev. D, 80, 043514 2, 3

Erkoca, A. E., Reno, M. H., & Sarcevic, I. 2010b, Phys.Rev., D82, 113006 3

Green, A. M., & Liddle, A. R. 1997, Phys. Rev. D, 56, 6166 1

Huang, X., Vertongen, G., & Weniger, C. 2012, JCAP, 1201, 042 6

Josan, A. S., & Green, A. M. 2010, Phys.Rev., D82, 083527 4

Jungman, G., Kamionkowski, M., & Griest, K. 1996, Phys.Rept., 267, 195 1

Komatsu, E., Smith, K. M., Dunkley, J., et al. 2011, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 192, 18 2

Ricotti, M., & Gould, A. 2009, ApJ, 707, 979 1, 2

Sandick, P., Spolyar, D., Buckley, M., Freese, K., & Hooper, D. 2010a, Phys. Rev. D, 81, 083506 2

Sandick, P., Spolyar, D., Buckley, M., Freese, K., & Hooper, D. 2010b, Phys. Rev. D, 81, 083506 3

Scott, P., & Sivertsson, S. 2009, Phys. Rev. Lett., 103, 211301 2

Steffen, F. D. 2009, Eur.Phys.J., C59, 557 3

Yang, Y., Huang, X., Chen, X., & Zong, H. 2011a, Phys.Rev., D84, 043506 4

Yang, Y., Yang, G., Huang, X., et al. 2013a, Phys. Rev. D, 87, 083519 2, 4

Yang, Y., Yang, G., & Zong, H. 2013b, Phys. Rev. D, 87, 103525 2, 3, 4, 6

Yang, Y.-P., Chen, X., Lu, T., & Zong, H.-S. 2011b, Eur.Phys.J.Plus, 126, 123 4

Yang, Y.-P., Yang, G.-L., & Zong, H.-S. 2013c, EPL (Europhysics Letters), 101, 69001 2, 4, 6

Yuan, Q., Yin, P.-F., Bi, X.-J., Zhang, X.-M., & Zhu, S.-H. 2010, Phys.Rev., D82, 023506 3